

Reduced Bone Loss Is Associated With Reduced Mortality Risk in Subjects Exposed to Nitrogen Bisphosphonates

Citation for published version (APA):

Bliuc, D., Tran, T., van Geel, T., Adachi, J. D., Berger, C., van den Bergh, J., Eisman, J. A., Geusens, P., Goltzman, D., Hanley, D. A., Josse, R., Kaiser, S., Kovacs, C. S., Langsetmo, L., Prior, J. C., Nguyen, T., Center, J. R., & CaMos Research Group (2019). Reduced Bone Loss Is Associated With Reduced Mortality Risk in Subjects Exposed to Nitrogen Bisphosphonates: A Mediation Analysis. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*, 34(11), 2001-2011. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.3816>

Document status and date:

Published: 01/11/2019

DOI:

[10.1002/jbmr.3816](https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.3816)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document license:

Taverne

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Reduced Bone Loss Is Associated With Reduced Mortality Risk in Subjects Exposed to Nitrogen Bisphosphonates: A Mediation Analysis

Dana Bliuc,^{1,18} Thach Tran,^{1,18} Tineke van Geel,² Jonathan D Adachi,³ Claudie Berger,⁴ Joop van den Bergh,^{5,6} John A Eisman,^{1,2,7,8,18} Piet Geusens,⁹ David Goltzman,¹⁰ David A Hanley,¹¹ Robert Josse,¹² Stephanie Kaiser,¹³ Christopher S Kovacs,¹⁴ Lisa Langsetmo,¹⁵ Jerilynn C Prior,¹⁶ Tuan V Nguyen,^{1,7,8,17,18} Jacqueline R Center,^{1,7,18} and for the CaMOS Research Group

¹Osteoporosis and Bone Biology, Garvan Institute of Medical Research, Sydney, Australia

²Máxima Medical Center, Department of Data & Analytics, MB Veldhoven, Netherlands

³Department of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada

⁴CaMos National Coordinating Centre, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

⁵Maastricht University Medical Center, Research School Nutrim, Department of Internal Medicine, Subdivision of Rheumatology, Maastricht, Netherlands

⁶VieCuri Medical Centre of Noord-Limburg, Department of Internal Medicine, Venlo, Netherlands

⁷Clinical School, St Vincent's Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, UNSW Australia, Sydney, Australia

⁸School of Medicine Sydney, University of Notre Dame Australia, Sydney, Australia

⁹University Hasselt, Biomedical Research Institute, Hasselt, Belgium

¹⁰Department of Medicine, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

¹¹Department of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

¹²Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

¹³Department of Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada

¹⁴Faculty of Medicine, Memorial University, St. John's, Canada

¹⁵School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minneapolis, MN, USA

¹⁶Department of Medicine and Endocrinology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

¹⁷School of Biomedical Engineering, University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), Australia

¹⁸St Vincent's Clinical School, UNSW Sydney

ABSTRACT

Bisphosphonates, potent antiresorptive agents, have been found to be associated with mortality reduction. Accelerated bone loss is, in itself, an independent predictor of mortality risk, but the relationship between bisphosphonates, bone loss, and mortality is unknown. This study aimed to determine whether the association between bisphosphonates and mortality is mediated by a reduction in the rate of bone loss. Participants from the population-based Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study were followed prospectively between 1996 and 2011. Comorbidities and lifestyle factors were collected at baseline and bone mineral density (BMD) at baseline and at years 3 (for those aged 40 to 60 years), 5, and 10. Rate of bone loss was calculated using linear regression. Information on medication use was obtained yearly. Bisphosphonate users grouped into nitrogen bisphosphonates (nBP; alendronate or risedronate) and etidronate and non-users (NoRx) were matched by propensity score, including all baseline factors as well as time of treatment. Cox's proportional hazards models, unadjusted and adjusted for annual rate of bone loss, were used to determine the association between nBP and etidronate versus NoRx. For the treatment groups with significant mortality risk reduction, the percent of mortality reduction mediated by a reduction in the rate of bone loss was estimated using a causal mediation analysis. There were 271 pairs of nBP and matched NoRx and 327 pairs of etidronate and matched NoRx. nBP but not etidronate use was associated with significant mortality risk reduction (hazard ratios [HR] = 0.61 [95% confidence interval 0.39–0.96] and 1.35 [95% CI 0.86–2.11] for nBP and etidronate, respectively). Rapid bone loss was associated with more than 2-fold increased mortality risk compared with no loss. Mediation analysis indicated that 39% (95% CI 7%–84%) of the nBP association with mortality was related to a reduction in the rate of bone loss. This finding provides an insight into the mechanism of the relationship between nBP and survival benefit in osteoporotic patients. © 2019 American Society for Bone and Mineral Research.

KEY WORDS: FRACTURE; MORTALITY RISK; BISPHOSPHONATE; BONE LOSS; PROSPECTIVE STUDY

Received in original form December 21, 2018; revised form May 24, 2019; accepted June 2, 2019. Accepted manuscript online June 19, 2019.

Address correspondence to: Dana Bliuc, MD, PhD, Garvan Institute of Medical Research, 384 Victoria Street, Darlinghurst, NSW, 2010, Australia. E-mail: d.bliuc@garvan.org.au

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article.

Journal of Bone and Mineral Research, Vol. 34, No. 11, November 2019, pp 2001–2011.

DOI: 10.1002/jbmr.3816

© 2019 American Society for Bone and Mineral Research

Introduction

Osteoporotic (fragility) fractures are very common, affecting 3 in 5 women and 1 in 3 men over the age of 50 years.⁽¹⁾ Furthermore, their prevalence is expected to rise as a consequence of increasing life expectancy and thus the number of individuals at risk.⁽²⁾ The burden of osteoporotic fracture resides not only in their increased risk of subsequent fracture^(3–5) but also in increased mortality risk.^(6–9)

Bisphosphonates are currently considered first-line treatment for osteoporosis worldwide^(10,11) with abundant evidence of their ability to reduce both vertebral and nonvertebral fracture risk.^(12–14) More recently, bisphosphonates have been also linked to improved survival.^(15,16) The first evidence of a positive association between bisphosphonate use and survival came from a randomized control trial (RCT) of zoledronic acid post-hip fracture.⁽¹⁵⁾ In this trial, zoledronic acid was associated with a 28% mortality risk reduction compared with placebo.⁽¹⁵⁾ Subsequently, a meta-analysis of anti-osteoporosis medication from eight RCTs (including risedronate, zoledronic acid, denosumab, and strontium ranelate)⁽¹⁶⁾ found a pooled benefit (~11%) of these agents on mortality risk.⁽¹⁶⁾ Interestingly, in this meta-analysis, the mortality risk reduction was predominantly observed in the trials with the highest background mortality risk. However, a more recent RCT of zoledronic acid in women with osteopenia has also shown a mortality risk reduction of ~35% over a longer follow-up time of 6 years, although it did not quite reach statistical significance.⁽¹⁷⁾ A positive association between bisphosphonates and mortality risk has also been reported in several observational osteoporosis cohorts,^(18–20) a fracture liaison service setting,⁽²¹⁾ and registry-based studies.^(22,23)

The mechanism by which bisphosphonates impact survival is not fully understood. Several hypotheses have been proposed to explain this effect. The most obvious explanation would be through a reduction in the rate of subsequent fractures. However, in the zoledronic acid RCT, only 8% of total deaths prevented were estimated to be mediated through this mechanism.⁽²⁴⁾ It is also possible that a reduction in the rate of bone loss may explain the mortality risk reduction observed in bisphosphonate-treated groups. Excessive bone loss is associated with increased mortality risk in both the general population as well as post-fracture.^(25,26) However, there is no information as to whether bone loss may play a role in mortality risk reduction associated with bisphosphonate use. Thus, this study aimed to determine whether the association between bisphosphonates and survival is mediated by a reduction in the rate of bone loss.

Materials and Methods

Subjects and setting

The study population consisted of women and men aged 50 years and older participating in the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study (CaMos), an ongoing prospective population-based study that was started in 1995. Participants were recruited randomly using residential telephone lists from the region surrounding nine urban centers in Canada. A detailed description of the study design and population sampling has been published previously.⁽²⁷⁾

The present study included participants who had at least two bone mineral density measurements and who either used one of bisphosphonates available (alendronate, risedronate, or etidronate)

or did not use any bone-related medication. Alendronate and etidronate were available at baseline, whereas risedronate became available later and participants started using it on average 9 years (± 3 years) later, resulting in a smaller number of risedronate users. Medication was classified, based on mechanism of action, as nitrogen bisphosphonates (alendronate or risedronate) and non-nitrogen (etidronate) bisphosphonate. To avoid misclassification, all the participants who switched between bisphosphonate types were excluded. Furthermore, this study used an intention-to-treat approach. Thus, participants were analyzed in the treatment group they were initially assigned regardless of whether they adhere or not to treatment.

A number of bisphosphonates and other treatments were excluded because of small numbers of users, namely clodronate, pamidronate, zoledronic acid, calcitonin, denosumab, raloxifene, tamoxifen, testosterone, or other sex hormone therapy.

Of the 9423 participants recruited, 7689 aged 50 years or older were screened for medication uptake and had had at least two bone mineral density measurements. After the first screening, it was found that very few men met the study criteria (68 on nitrogen bisphosphonate and 87 on etidronate), and therefore analysis was restricted to women only (Fig. 1).

CaMos was approved by the Ethics Committee of McGill University and at each participating center.

Outcomes and risk factors

A standardized interviewer-administered questionnaire was obtained at baseline (1995–97). Information was obtained on lifestyle factors (ie, smoking, physical activity), demographics, education, comorbidities, and medication use. In addition to this structured questionnaire, each participant had a clinical visit that included anthropometric (ie, height, weight) and bone mineral density (femoral neck and lumbar spine) measurements.


This information was subsequently obtained in years 5 and 10. In those aged 40 to 60 years at entry, another clinical visit was conducted at year 3. Yearly postal self-administered questionnaires for incident fractures and medications were obtained between clinical visits.

Bone mineral density assessment

Bone mineral density was measured as femoral neck and lumbar spine areal bone mineral density (BMD) at baseline and then subsequently in years 3 (40 to 60 years of age), 5, and 10. BMD assessment was performed by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA; Discovery W, Hologic, Bedford, MA, USA). Standardization between DXA scanners was assessed by scanning a single phantom, which was circulated among centers.⁽²⁸⁾

Participants and/or their primary care physician received a copy of the BMD report performed at baseline and all subsequent visits. They did not receive any formal fracture risk assessment or management suggestions from the CaMos investigators.

The annual percent change in bone mineral density was calculated for each individual participant using a linear regression model to determine the intercept (at baseline) and the slope of BMD over time for both femoral neck and lumbar spine sites. The annual rate of bone loss was calculated as the ratio between the slope and the intercept. The annual percent bone loss was compared according to medication use. For the nonmedication users, all BMD measurements were used in



^ The list of bone related medication not eligible includes: pamidronate, clodronate, calcitonin, SERMS, Hormone therapy and Tamoxifen

Fig. 1. Flow chart of study participants.

calculation, whereas for the medication users, the rate of bone loss was calculated based on 1 measurement before first visit with medication and all the subsequent BMD measurements following that visit. For participants who started medication after the year 10 visit ($n = 294$), this could not be calculated.

Participants with at least one BMD measurement were included in a sensitivity analysis. Their individual rate of bone loss at the site of femoral neck was estimated using mixed-effects models. These models estimate a rate of bone loss in individuals with one measurement based on the general trend of the participants who have all or almost all measurements.

Fracture ascertainment

Self-reported incident clinical fractures were obtained yearly and at clinical visits. Information on the date, site, and circumstance of the fracture was obtained by interview and an X-ray report sought. The majority of fractures (78%) were confirmed by medical report.⁽²⁹⁾ This study included only incident fragility fractures. Skull, sternum, finger, and toe fractures were excluded.

Mortality ascertainment

Deaths occurring during the study follow-up were ascertained by contact with the next of kin or proxy if the yearly questionnaire was not returned. In some centers, deaths were verified by obituaries.

Statistical analysis

Nitrogen bisphosphonates (nBP; alendronate and risedronate) and non-nBP (etidronate), because of the higher potency of the

former and different mechanism of action, were analyzed separately.

Baseline characteristics were examined for the two classes of bisphosphonates (nBP and non-nBP) in comparison to non-treated participants (NoRx) (t tests for continuous and chi-square tests for categorical variables). Because of significant differences in baseline characteristics between treatment groups, participants who received medication during the follow-up were matched 1:1 to NoRx based on propensity score. Propensity score was calculated using a multivariate logistic regression model with treatment as outcome and adjustment for all baseline characteristics. The treated and not-treated participants were then matched using the SAS macro "gmatch" based on a propensity score difference of less than half SD and the condition that not-treated participants should be alive when the treated participants started treatment.

The relationship between medication use, annual rate of bone loss, and mortality risk was assessed in two nested sets of nBP and non-nBP users (etidronate) matched 1:1 to NoRx participants using a single causal mediation analysis.⁽³⁰⁾ Briefly, mediation analysis seeks to explain the underlying mechanism between an independent and dependent variable by inclusion of a third variable, which represents the hypothesized mediator. The mediation model thus tests the hypothesis that the independent variable influences the mediator variable, which in turn influences the dependent variable. According to this model, a variable is likely to be a mediator upon meeting three conditions: the independent variable is significantly associated with the mediator; the mediator is significantly associated with the dependent variable; and the association between independent and dependent variable decreases and become not significant in the presence of mediator. This study utilizes this methodology to test whether the relationship between bisphosphonates (independent variable) and survival




Fig. 2. Mediation models with path coefficients: a = regression model for treatment and rate of femoral neck bone loss; b = Cox's model for rate of bone loss and survival; c' = Cox's model for treatment and survival adjusted for rate of femoral neck bone loss; c = Cox's model for treatment and survival not adjusted for rate of femoral neck bone loss. All models were adjusted for baseline characteristics with standardized mean difference (SMD) ≥ 0.3 (Table 1).

(dependent variable) is mediated by a reduction in the annual rate of bone loss (mediator variable).⁽³¹⁾ Four models were thus constructed: 1) a linear regression model of treatment with annual percent change of bone loss as the outcome (path a); 2) a Cox's proportional hazards model of annual percent bone loss with survival as the outcome (path b); 3) a Cox's proportional hazards model of treatment and survival without adjustment for annual percent bone loss (path c); 4) a multivariate Cox's proportional hazards model of treatment with adjustment for annual percent bone loss with survival as outcome (path c') (Fig. 2). Given that the treated participants were matched by propensity score with nontreated participants, there were few unbalanced variables. Double adjustment has been recommended for all variables with standardized mean difference (SMD) ≥ 0.10 after matching.⁽³²⁾ To be more conservative, we have adjusted for all variables with a SMD ≥ 0.03 after matching. All four mediation models described above were adjusted for the variables with SMD ≥ 0.03 (paths a, b, c, c').⁽³³⁾ Follow-up was calculated from the time of medication start for both treated and nontreated. For nontreated, this starting point was obtained by the addition to baseline date his/her "pair's" time of medication commencement. In each survival model, the strength of the association between treatment, annual percent bone change, and survival was assessed by the hazard ratio and the 95% confidence interval (CI).

If the associations between treatment and both survival and bone loss reduction were significant, a causal mediation analysis was performed using the % mediate Macro publicly available (<https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/donna-spiegelman/software/mediate>). This analysis estimates the point and interval estimates of the percent of the treatment effect mediated by the mediator (ie, annual percent change in bone mineral density) using Cox regression survival analysis.

All statistical analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4 for Windows (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

Results

This study included 1743 women aged 50 years or older who had at least two BMD measurements, followed for a median of 15.0 years (interquartile range [IQR] 10.5 to 15.0). During this

follow-up, 454 (26%) women experienced an incident fracture, and 241 (14%) died. BMD declined at the site of femoral neck with a median of $-0.38\%/year$ (IQR -1.00 to 0.22) and increased slightly at the lumbar spine with a median of $+0.22\%/year$ (IQR -0.39 to 0.92).

Women were classified according to treatment as nBP ($n = 387$), etidronate users ($n = 337$), and NoRx ($n = 1019$). All bisphosphonate users had several factors associated with poorer survival: significantly lower femoral neck BMD, weight, and more prior fractures than NoRx individuals. They also had several factors associated with "healthy users," such as better education, lifestyle habits (less smoking, more exercise, and more vitamin D use), and less cardiovascular disease and diabetes (Table 1). To overcome this imbalance in characteristics, treated participants were matched 1:1 to nontreated participants based on a propensity score, which included age, weight, femoral neck BMD, prior fractures, education, lifestyle habits (smoking and exercise), and comorbidities.

There was no difference in the prevalence of treatment across the nine study centers.

Etidronate versus matched nontreatment

Almost all etidronate users (327 of 337) were matched 1:1 by propensity score to nontreated participants. After matching, all baseline variables had a standardized mean difference less than 0.10, except age (nontreated were older) and smoking (more in nontreated) (Table 1). Follow-up time was comparable between etidronate and nontreatment groups (9.0 years [IQR 6 to 13] for etidronate and 9 years [IQR 6 to 12] for nontreatment, $p = 0.7$).

The number of incident fractures were similar between etidronate users and matched nonusers (53 [16%] for etidronate users versus 43 [13%] for nonusers; adjusted hazard ratio [HR] = 1.27 [95% CI 0.71–2.25]; $p = 0.42$).

Mortality rates were similar for etidronate and NoRx groups (27 deaths/1000 person-years follow-up [95% CI 16–26] and 23 deaths/1000 person-years follow-up [95% CI 18–28] for etidronate and NoRx, respectively) (Fig. 3, Table 2).

Etidronate users had a significantly lower rate of bone loss than NoRx for femoral neck (difference $0.29\%/year$ [95% CI 0.06 – 0.52]) and lumbar spine (difference $0.56\%/year$ [0.38–0.75]). Individuals with the highest rate of femoral neck bone loss had increased risk of mortality compared with those with lower rate

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of Female Participants According to Medication Use

Characteristics	Nitrogen Bisphosphonates and No Treatment					
	Unmatched			Matched		
	Nitrogen bisphosphonate	No treatment	SMD	Nitrogen bisphosphonate	No treatment	SMD
No. of participants	387	1019		271	271	
Age ^a (years)	64.8 (8.2)	65.6 (8.2)	−0.09	65.2 (8.1)	65.1 (8.1)	0.01
Weight ^a (kg)	64.7 (11.2)	73.6 (14.1)	−0.720	66.4 (11.4)	67.0 (11.8)	−0.02
Higher education ^b	114 (29.5)	214 (21)	0.178	75 (27.6)	70 (25.8)	−0.06
Prior fracture ^b	115 (29.7)	261 (25.6)	0.090	83 (30.6)	80 (29.5)	0.010
FN BMD ^a (g/cm ²)	0.64 (0.09)	0.73 (0.11)	−0.850	0.66 (0.09)	0.66 (0.11)	−0.06
LS BMD ^a (g/cm ²)	0.82 (0.13)	0.97 (0.15)	−0.972	0.85 (0.13)	0.85 (0.13)	−0.02
Comorbidities ^b						
Heart disease	18 (4.7)	71 (7.0)	−0.169	11 (4.1)	13 (4.8)	0.02
Diabetes	11 (2.8)	83 (8.1)	−0.212	9 (3.3)	14 (5.2)	−0.09
Neurological	10 (2.6)	27 (2.6)	−0.023	8 (2.9)	3 (1.1)	0.15
Respiratory	28 (7.2)	79 (7.8)	0.058	22 (8.1)	21 (7.7)	0.009
Cancer	19 (4.9)	67 (6.6)	0.034	10 (3.7)	17 (6.3)	−0.10
Lifestyle factors ^b						
Exercise	253 (65.4)	585 (57.4)	0.166	171 (63.1)	169 (62.4)	0.03
Smoking	41 (10.6)	142 (13.9)	−0.121	27 (10.1)	41 (15.1)	−0.14

Characteristics	Etidronate and no treatment					
	Unmatched			Matched		
	Etidronate	No treatment	SMD	Etidronate	No treatment	SMD
No. of participants	337	1019		327	327	
Age ^a (years)	67.7 (8.0)	65.6 (8.2)	0.276	67.7 (8.1)	68.6 (8.6)	−0.10
Weight ^a (kg)	66.5 (12.2)	73.6 (14.1)	−0.484	66.5 (12.1)	66.4 (10.9)	0.006
Higher education ^b	67 (19.9)	214 (21.0)	−0.03	67 (20.5)	57 (17.4)	0.08
Prior fracture ^b	98 (29.1)	261 (25.6)	0.093	98 (30.0)	102 (31.2)	−0.03
FN BMD ^a (g/cm ²)	0.64 (0.09)	0.73 (0.11)	−0.879	0.64 (0.09)	0.64 (0.09)	−0.02
LS BMD ^a (g/cm ²)	0.86 (0.13)	0.97 (0.15)	−0.760	0.86 (0.13)	0.87 (0.12)	−0.05
Comorbidities ^b						
Heart disease	31 (9.2)	71 (6.9)	0.0236	30 (9.2)	23 (7.0)	0.08
Diabetes	17 (5.0)	83 (8.1)	−0.256	17 (5.2)	24 (7.3)	−0.09
Neurological	14 (4.1)	27 (2.7)	0.057	14 (4.3)	11 (3.4)	0.05
Respiratory	32 (9.5)	79 (7.7)	0.097	32 (9.8)	32 (9.8)	0.00
Cancer	24 (7.1)	67 (6.5)	0.064	23 (7.0)	23 (7.0)	0.00
Lifestyle factors ^b						
Exercise	205 (60.8)	585 (57.4)	0.081	199 (60.9)	183 (56.0)	0.10
Smoking	38 (11.3)	142 (13.9)	−0.074	36 (11.0)	50 (15.3)	−0.130

SMD = standardized mean difference; FN = femoral neck; BMD = bone mineral density; LS = lumbar spine (L₁ to L₄).

^aMean (SD).

^bNo. (%); boldface represents variable unbalanced after matching (SMD >0.10).

of bone loss (Fig. 4B). By contrast, a higher rate of bone loss at the site of lumbar spine was not associated with increased mortality risk. However, because of the nonsignificant effect of etidronate on survival, mediation analysis was not performed.

Nitrogen bisphosphonates versus matched nontreatment

Of the 387 nitrogen bisphosphonate users, 271 could be matched 1:1 to nontreated participants, all with two or more BMD measurements. After matching, the standardized mean differences between variables were less than 0.10 except for

neurological conditions (more prevalent in treated), cancer (more prevalent in nontreated), and smoking (more prevalent in nontreated) (Table 1). Follow-up time after medication start was on average ~9 (IQR 7 to 12) years for nBP users and ~7 (IQR 5 to 10) years for nontreated.

The number of incident fractures was similar between treated and nontreated ($n = 50$ [18%] for nBP users and $n = 53$ [20%] for nonusers; $p = 0.74$). Fracture risk was similar between treatment group (adjusted HR = 1.0 [95% CI 0.53–1.90]). However, there was an interaction between treatment and baseline femoral neck BMD, and a subgroup analysis of individuals with a T -score ≤ -2.5 SD revealed a




Fig. 3. Kaplan-Meier survival curves for nitrogen bisphosphonates versus matched no treatment and etidronate versus no treatment.

nonsignificant but clinically relevant fracture risk reduction associated with nBP use (adjusted HR = 0.40 [95% CI 0.12–1.32]).

Mortality rates were significantly lower for nBP users (9 deaths/1000 person-years [95% CI 5–13]) compared with NoRx (17 deaths/1000 person-years [95% CI 11–22]; $p = 0.03$ (Table 2, Fig. 3). The rate of bone loss was significantly lower in the nBP group compared with matched nontreated at both femoral neck (difference 0.64%/year [95% CI 0.42–0.86]; $p < 0.0001$) and lumbar spine sites (difference 0.77%/year [95% CI 0.56–0.98; $p < 0.0001$). Moreover, the highest quartile of bone loss was associated with increased mortality risk (Fig. 4A). Cox proportional hazard analysis determined that individuals with accelerated rate of bone loss at the site of femoral neck (highest quartile of bone loss) had a ~2-fold higher mortality risk compared with those who were in the lower bone loss quartiles (HR = 2.0 [95% CI 1.1–3.6]) (Fig. 4A). Bone loss at the site of lumbar spine was not associated with mortality risk.

Given the significant association between survival and both nBP treatment and the annual rate of bone loss, a causal mediation analysis was performed to determine the proportion of mortality risk reduction mediated through a reduction in the rate of bone loss. The relationship between treatment and mortality not adjusted by hypothesized mediator (annual rate of femoral neck BMD loss) was 0.61 (95% CI 0.39–0.96). However, after adjusting for the mediator, the relationship between treatment and mortality decreased and became nonsignificant (HR = 0.74 [95% CI 0.46–1.19]). The proportion of mortality risk reduction mediated by a reduction in the rate of femoral neck bone loss was estimated at ~39% (95% CI 7%–84%) (Fig. 2). Adjustment for the unbalanced covariates ($SMD \geq 0.03$) only marginally affected the causal relationship between treatment, annual rate of bone loss, and survival (Fig. 2). None of the baseline variables still unbalanced after matching were significantly associated with mortality risk (age-adjusted HR: neurological conditions, 1.00 [95% CI

0.06–16.00]; $p = 0.89$; cancer, 1.52 [95% CI 0.62–3.77], and smoking 0.91 [95% CI 0.31–2.64]) and thus could not mediate the relationship between treatment and survival.

Sensitivity analysis

The participants who only had one BMD measurement (28% of nontreated and 41% of those treated) were additionally included in a sensitivity analysis. After matching, there were 487 nBP users matched 1:1 to nonusers and 466 etidronate users matched 1:1 to nonusers (Supplemental Table S1). Similar to the primary analysis, several baseline variables remained unbalanced ($SMD \geq 0.10$) after matching (ie, age, weight, diabetes). nBP treatment was associated with significant reduction in mortality risk after adjustment for all baseline variables excluding rate of BMD loss (Supplemental Table S2). Similar to the primary analysis, after adjustment for the rate of bone loss, the magnitude of the treatment effect on mortality risk reduction decreased. The mediation model indicated that the rate of bone loss mediated ~45% of the mortality rate difference between treated and nontreated (percent mediated: 45.2% [95% CI 12.3%–83.0%]; $p = 0.01$). The findings of the sensitivity analysis confirmed the robustness of the primary analyses.

Etidronate use was not associated with lower mortality rates than the matched nonusers (Supplemental Table S2).

Discussion

Recent evidence suggests that treatment with bisphosphonates is associated not only with fracture risk reduction but also with a reduction in mortality risk. However, the mechanism behind this association is not yet understood. In this observational study, nitrogen bisphosphonates were associated with

Table 2. Models of the Association Between Treatment, Mediator, and Survival: 1) Treatment and Bone Loss; 2) Treatment and Survival Unadjusted; and 3) Adjusted for Mediator

Models/outcomes ^a	Treatment	No Treatment	Treatment versus no treatment	p Value
Nitrogen bisphosphonates and no treatment				
1) Linear regression model of treatment and the mediator – rate of bone change (outcome)	Median (IQR)	Median (IQR)	Difference in annual rate (95% CI)	
% Annual rate of FN BMD change (median, IQR)	0.11 (–0.52 to 0.87)	–0.56 (–1.17 to –0.06)	0.64 (0.42 to 0.86)	<0.0001
% Annual rate of LS BMD change (median, IQR)	0.68 (–0.21 to 1.47)	–0.12 (–0.73 to 0.58)	0.77 (0.56 to 0.98)	<0.0001
2) Cox's model of treatment and survival (outcome)	Mortality rates (95% CI)	Mortality rates (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	
Treatment unadjusted	8.89 (5.19 to 12.60)	16.70 (11.20 to 22.20)	0.61 (0.39 to 0.96)	0.03
3) Cox's model of treatment and survival (outcome) adjusted for the mediator – rate of bone change			HR (95% CI)	
Treatment multivariable adjusted + % annual rate FN BMD			0.74 (0.46 to 1.19)	0.17
Treatment multivariable adjusted + % annual rate LS BMD			0.61 (0.32 to 1.18)	0.14
Etidronate and no treatment				
1) Linear regression model of treatment and the mediator – rate of bone change (outcome)	Median (IQR)	Median (IQR)	Difference in annual rate (95% CI)	
% Annual rate of FN BMD change (median, IQR)	–0.18 (–0.94 to 0.53)	–0.58 (–1.16 to –0.05)	0.29 (0.06 to 0.52)	0.012
% Annual rate of LS BMD change (median, IQR)	0.56 (–0.12 to 1.47)	0.11 (–0.52 to 0.71)	0.56 (0.38 to 0.75)	<0.0001
2) Cox's model of treatment and survival (outcome)	Mortality rates (95% CI)	Mortality rates (95% CI)	HR (95% CI)	
Treatment unadjusted	26.60 (15.50 to 25.70)	22.90 (17.50 to 28.30)	1.35 (0.86 to 2.11)	0.19
3) Cox's model of treatment and survival (outcome) adjusted for mediator – rate of bone change			HR (95% CI)	
Treatment multivariable adjusted + % annual rate FN BMD			1.59 (0.97 to 2.61)	0.07
Treatment multivariable adjusted + % annual rate LS BMD			1.36 (0.85 to 2.17)	0.20

IQR = interquartile range; CI = confidence interval; HR = hazard ratio; FN = femoral neck; BMD = bone mineral density; LS = lumbar spine.

Mortality rates presented as deaths per 1000/person-years.

^aAdjusted for all baseline variables with standardized mean difference (SMD) ≥ 0.03 (Table 1).




Fig. 4. Hazard ratios of mortality for quartiles of femoral neck bone loss in nitrogen bisphosphonates and no treatment (A) and etidronate and no treatment (B).

both a significantly lower mortality risk and a significantly lower rate of bone loss compared with nontreated individuals with similar baseline mortality risk. Individuals in the highest quartile of bone loss were twice as likely to die compared with those with lower rates of bone loss. Using mediation analysis to combine these findings, approximately 39% of the mortality risk reduction in the nitrogen bisphosphonate group was found to be mediated through a reduction in the rate of bone loss. Although causality cannot be confirmed in an observational study, this statistical mediation analysis suggests that lower rates of bone loss are associated with mortality reduction in those on nitrogen bisphosphonates.

We have previously shown in the same cohort that nitrogen bisphosphonates were associated with ~34% mortality risk reduction, whereas etidronate, a non-nitrogen bisphosphonate, was not associated with any survival benefit.⁽³⁴⁾ Although this finding suggested the existence of a possible “true” survival benefit over the unavoidable “healthy bias” effect, it did not provide any explanation for this effect. The risk of future fracture investigated as potential mediator of mortality risk reduction was not significantly reduced in treatment groups, perhaps attributable to a higher baseline fracture risk in treated versus nontreated individuals. However, the existence of a survival benefit only in the group taking the most potent bisphosphonates, when analyzed in a direct head-to-head comparison with non-nitrogen bisphosphonate, together with the evidence from previous studies that bone loss is associated with increased mortality risk^(25,26) led to the hypothesis that bone loss reduction may contribute to the mortality risk reduction observed with nitrogen bisphosphonates. The present study confirmed the survival benefit of nitrogen bisphosphonates in a subset of individuals, in whom rate of bone loss could be reliably assessed through multiple bone mineral density tests. This study also confirmed the associations between nitrogen bisphosphonates and bone loss reduction, previously demonstrated in this cohort.⁽³⁵⁾ An accelerated rate of bone loss was independently associated with a ~2-fold increased mortality risk. Importantly, the addition of bone loss to the model of nitrogen bisphosphonates and survival lessened this association. According to the statistical definition of mediation, a reduction in the rate of

bone loss is a partial mediator of the relationship between nitrogen bisphosphonates and survival because: 1) nitrogen bisphosphonates are associated with a reduction in the rate of bone loss; 2) bone loss significantly predicts mortality risk; 3) the relationship between nitrogen bisphosphonates and survival was diminished and became not significant after adjusting for bone loss; and 4) bone loss remained significantly associated with survival in the final model.

Using a causal mediation analysis, it was estimated that ~39% of the mortality risk reduction associated with nitrogen bisphosphonates was mediated by a reduction in the rate of bone loss. In contrast with nitrogen bisphosphonate, etidronate use was associated with a weaker effect on bone loss reduction and was not associated with mortality risk reduction.

Notably, this mediation effect of bone loss was site specific. This difference is probably driven by the spurious increase in lumbar spine BMD due to degenerative disease that occurs in the aging population. In the current study, the trajectories of BMD change at the two bone sites were divergent, with loss experienced only at the femoral neck site, but increase in lumbar spine BMD, consistent with osteoarthritic lesions in the lumbar spine that increase with age. Thus, lumbar spine BMD change was not a predictor of mortality risk.

In the current study, the trajectories of BMD change at the two bone sites were divergent, with loss experienced only at the femoral neck site, consistent with osteoarthritic lesions, which increase with age. Because of the same reasons, lumbar spine BMD change was not a predictor of mortality risk.

The association between femoral neck bone loss and mortality risk has been previously demonstrated in both individuals with and without fracture.^(25,26) The mechanism behind this association is most likely multifactorial. The high bone turnover associated with bone loss may lead to release of heavy metals from bone,⁽³⁶⁾ which subsequently predisposes to cardiovascular risk.⁽³⁷⁾ Several articles have reported bone loss as a component of the geriatric frailty syndrome characterized by deterioration in physical function and activity with an increased propensity for falling, fracture, and mortality risk.^(38–40) It has been proposed that the mechanism behind the geriatric syndrome may be the presence of a chronic low inflammatory state, which subsequently leads to

bone loss, disability, and increased fracture risk and mortality. Chronic inflammation is characterized by overproduction of cytokines such as IL-1, IL-6, and TNF- α , which not only perpetuate the inflammatory state but also activate bone resorption and inhibition of bone-building mechanisms.⁽⁴¹⁾ Bisphosphonates, besides their antiresorptive effect on bone, also have anti-inflammatory properties.⁽⁴²⁾ In vitro studies indicated that these agents impair macrophage differentiation and promote macrophage cytotoxicity and apoptosis. In vivo, nitrogen bisphosphonates induce a pro-inflammatory effect in the short term, but chronic administration may suppress pro-inflammatory cytokines. A recent study reported that treatment with bisphosphonates for 1 year was associated with a significant reduction in plasma IL-6, IL-17, and IL-23 compared with controls.⁽⁴³⁾

Besides the anti-inflammatory effect discussed above, some evidence suggests that bisphosphonates may have an effect on the immune system. In a recent study, treatment with zoledronic acid was associated with activation of gamma delta T cells, which are involved in the immune defense against infection.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Furthermore, in a post hoc analysis of the potential mediators of the mortality risk reduction observed in patients treated with zoledronic acid after hip fracture, treatment was associated with a significant reduction in deaths due to pneumonia, despite a similar incidence of the condition.⁽²⁴⁾ Notably, in a recent RCT of zoledronic acid in women with osteopenia, treatment was associated with a significant reduction in the incidence of cancer (HR = 0.67 [95% CI 0.50–0.89]).⁽¹⁷⁾

It is most likely that other mechanisms are involved in the mortality risk reduction associated with nitrogen bisphosphonates. There is a clear epidemiological association between bone loss and arterial calcification⁽⁴⁵⁾ that suggest common pathways, although the mechanism is not fully understood. Data from randomized controlled studies suggest a reduction of cardiovascular mortality risk in patients treated with risedronate and zoledronate.^(24,46) Bisphosphonates have also been associated with a reduced risk of myocardial infarction in a case-control study of hip and vertebral fractures⁽⁴⁷⁾ and in patients with rheumatoid arthritis.⁽⁴⁸⁾ In the RCT of zoledronic acid in women with osteopenia, treatment was associated with a nonsignificant reduction in the incidence of myocardial infarction and stroke.⁽¹⁷⁾ Furthermore, in a recent RCT comparing romososumab and alendronate, the incidence of severe cardiovascular events was higher in the romososumab than alendronate groups, despite a similar cardiovascular risk at baseline.⁽⁴⁹⁾ As romososumab was not associated with increased cardiovascular events in the previous and larger FRAME trial (romososumab versus placebo), it is possible that the increased cardiovascular events observed in romososumab versus alendronate may be attributable to a reduction in cardiovascular events for alendronate. However, in a recent meta-analysis of RCTs, bisphosphonates were not associated with a reduction in major cardiovascular events, although these events were not formally adjudicated.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Thus, there is still uncertainty about any of these potential mechanisms.

This study has several strengths. CaMos had a large number of bisphosphonate users in comparison to other population-based studies (more than 40% of women).⁽¹⁸⁾ This relatively large number of bisphosphonate users permitted an analysis of bisphosphonates according to their class, as well as adjustment for a large set of risk factors. The long follow-up permitted an investigation of the role of bone loss on mortality risk and its role in mediating mortality reduction in individuals treated with bisphosphonates. However, there are some limitations. Treatment

was not randomly allocated and thus part of the observed association between treatment and survival could be related to confounding. The treated group had significantly higher baseline fracture risk (ie, lower BMD and weight, more prior fractures) and had a different comorbidity profile from the nontreated group. To counteract these selection biases, this study used propensity score matching based on both baseline variables, which, similar to randomization, is designed to produce groups with similar baseline risk, while acknowledging that there still may remain unknown confounders. The technique resulted in groups with similar baseline characteristics, albeit few exceptions. However, none of the imbalanced factors were associated with mortality risk. Nevertheless, these factors may reduce the generalizability of these findings. Lastly, mediation analysis findings need to be interpreted through the light of its limitations. Mediation analysis has been developed to test a causal association. However, causality cannot be proven in an epidemiological study. In this context, our analyses have only demonstrated that the data aligns with the proposed causal hypothesis.

In summary, in this long-term prospective population-based study, nitrogen bisphosphonate use in women was associated with both better survival and a significant reduction in the rate of bone loss. Bone loss was significantly associated with increased mortality risk with those in the highest quartile of bone loss being twice as likely to die compared with those who did not lose bone. Using a mediation analysis approach, approximately 39% of the difference in mortality rates between treatment groups was found to be related to the greater bone loss in the nontreated versus the treated groups.

In conclusion, this study offers a plausible explanation for the association between potent antiresorptive medication and survival. Future mechanistic studies into osteoporosis, antiresorptive treatment, and survival are warranted.

Disclosures

DB, TT, TvG, CB, DG, RGJ, LL, CSK, SMK and JCP have no competing interests to declare. JDA has received research grants and/or personal fees from Amgen, Eli Lilly, Merck, Actavis and AgNovos. JvdB has received grants and/or personal fees from Amgen, MSD, and Eli Lilly. JAE has consulted for and/or received research funding from Amgen, deCode, Merck Sharp and Dohme, and Sanofi-Aventis. PG was advisory member for Amgen, has received speaker fee and/or research grants from Amgen, Pfizer, MSD, UCB, Abbott, Lilly, BMS, Novartis, Roche and Will Pharma. DAH has consulted for and/or received speaker fee and/or research funding from Amgen, Merck and Eli Lilly. TVN has received honoraria for consulting and symposia from Merck Sharp and Dohme, Roche, Servier, Sanofi-Aventis, and Novartis. JRC has consulted for and/or given educational talks for Merck Sharp and Dohme, Amgen, Actavis and Sanofi-Aventis.

Acknowledgment

The Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study was funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR); Merck Frosst Canada Ltd.; Eli Lilly Canada Inc.; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Inc.; The Alliance: sanofi-aventis & Procter and Gamble

Pharmaceuticals Canada Inc.; Servier Canada Inc.; Amgen Canada Inc.; The Dairy Farmers of Canada; and The Arthritis Society.

This work was supported by the National Health Medical Research Council Australia Projects 1070187, 1008219, and 1073430. DB was supported by a fellowship from Australian and New Zealand Bone and Mineral Society. Other funding bodies were an Osteoporosis Australia-Amgen grant; the Mrs Gibson and Ernst Heine Family Foundation.

Authors roles: DB and JRC designed the study. DB, TT, and JRC analysed the data. DB, TT and JRC drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data and revision of the manuscript. DB and JRC had primary responsibility for final content and acts as guarantors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript. The funding sources had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; nor did they have a role in preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript and the decision to submit for publication.

References

1. Nguyen ND, Ahlborg HG, Center JR, Eisman JA, Nguyen TV. Residual lifetime risk of fractures in women and men. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2007;22(6):781–8.
2. Reginster JY, Burlet N. Osteoporosis: a still increasing prevalence. *Bone*. 2006;38(2 Suppl 1):S4–9.
3. Center JR, Bliuc D, Nguyen TV, Eisman JA. Risk of subsequent fracture after low-trauma fracture in men and women. *JAMA*. 2007;297(4):387–94.
4. Kanis JA, Johnell O, De Laet C, et al. A meta-analysis of previous fracture and subsequent fracture risk. *Bone*. 2004;35(2):375–82.
5. Klotzbuecher CM, Ross PD, Landsman PB, Abbott TA 3rd, Berger M. Patients with prior fractures have an increased risk of future fractures: a summary of the literature and statistical synthesis. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2000;15(4):721–39.
6. Bliuc D, Nguyen ND, Milch VE, Nguyen TV, Eisman JA, Center JR. Mortality risk associated with low-trauma osteoporotic fracture and subsequent fracture in men and women. *JAMA*. 2009;301(5):513–21.
7. Center JR, Nguyen TV, Schneider D, Sambrook PN, Eisman JA. Mortality after all major types of osteoporotic fracture in men and women: an observational study. *Lancet*. 1999;353(9156):878–82.
8. Cauley JA, Thompson DE, Ensrud KC, Scott JC, Black D. Risk of mortality following clinical fractures. *Osteoporos Int*. 2000;11(7):556–61.
9. Tran T, Bliuc D, van Geel T, et al. Population-wide impact of non-hip non-vertebral fractures on mortality. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2017;32(9):1802–10.
10. Chen JS, Sambrook PN. Antiresorptive therapies for osteoporosis: a clinical overview. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*. 2012;8(2):81–91.
11. Reginster JY. Antifracture efficacy of currently available therapies for postmenopausal osteoporosis. *Drugs*. 2011;71(1):65–78.
12. Liu M, Guo L, Pei Y, et al. Efficacy of zoledronic acid in treatment of osteoporosis in men and women—a meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Exp Med*. 2015;8(3):3855–61.
13. Chen L, Wang G, Zheng F, Zhao H, Li H. Efficacy of bisphosphonates against osteoporosis in adult men: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Osteoporos Int*. 2015;26(9):2355–63.
14. Hochberg MC. Nonvertebral fracture risk reduction with nitrogen-containing bisphosphonates. *Curr Osteoporos Rep*. 2008;6(3):89–94.
15. Lyles KW, Colon-Emeric CS, Magaziner JS, et al. Zoledronic acid and clinical fractures and mortality after hip fracture. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357(18):1799–809.
16. Bolland MJ, Grey AB, Gamble GD, Reid IR. Effect of osteoporosis treatment on mortality: a meta-analysis. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2010;95(3):1174–81.
17. Reid IR, Horne AM, Mihov B, et al. Fracture prevention with zoledronate in older women with osteopenia. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(25):2407–16.
18. Center JR, Bliuc D, Nguyen ND, Nguyen TV, Eisman JA. Osteoporosis medication and reduced mortality risk in elderly women and men. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2011;96(4):1006–14.
19. Cree MW, Juby AG, Carriere KC. Mortality and morbidity associated with osteoporosis drug treatment following hip fracture. *Osteoporos Int*. 2003;14(9):722–7.
20. Lee P, Ng C, Slattery A, Nair P, Eisman JA, Center JR. Preadmission bisphosphonate and mortality in critically ill patients. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2016;101(5):1945–53.
21. van Geel T, Bliuc D, Geusens PPM, et al. Reduced mortality and subsequent fracture risk associated with oral bisphosphonate recommendation in a fracture liaison service setting: a prospective cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(6):e0198006.
22. Brozek W, Reichardt B, Zwerina J, Dimai HP, Klaushofer K, Zwettler E. Antiresorptive therapy and risk of mortality and refracture in osteoporosis-related hip fracture: a nationwide study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2016;27(1):387–96.
23. Bondo L, Eiken P, Abrahamsen B. Analysis of the association between bisphosphonate treatment survival in Danish hip fracture patients—a nationwide register-based open cohort study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2013;24(1):245–52.
24. Colon-Emeric CS, Mesenbrink P, Lyles KW, et al. Potential mediators of the mortality reduction with zoledronic acid after hip fracture. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2010;25(1):91–7.
25. Bliuc D, Nguyen ND, Alarkawi D, Nguyen TV, Eisman JA, Center JR. Accelerated bone loss and increased post-fracture mortality in elderly women and men. *Osteoporos Int*. 2015;26(4):1331–9.
26. Nguyen ND, Center JR, Eisman JA, Nguyen TV. Bone loss, weight loss, and weight fluctuation predict mortality risk in elderly men and women. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2007;22(8):1147–54.
27. Kreiger N, Tenenhouse A, Joseph L, et al. The Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study (CaMos): background, rationale, methods. *Can J Aging*. 1999;18(3):376–87.
28. Targownik LE, Leslie WD, Davison KS, et al. The relationship between proton pump inhibitor use and longitudinal change in bone mineral density: a population-based study [corrected] from the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study (CaMos). *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2012;107(9):1361–9.
29. Prior JC, Langsetmo L, Lentle BC, et al. Ten-year incident osteoporosis-related fractures in the population-based Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study—comparing site and age-specific risks in women and men. *Bone*. 2015;71:237–43.
30. MacKinnon DP, Fairchild AJ, Fritz MS. Mediation analysis. *Ann Rev Psychol*. 2007;58:593–614.
31. MacKinnon D. Introduction to statistical mediation analysis. New York: Routledge; 2012.
32. Nguyen TL, Collins GS, Spence J, et al. Double-adjustment in propensity score matching analysis: choosing a threshold for considering residual imbalance. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2017;17(1):78.
33. Austin PC. Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. *Stat Med*. 2009;28(25):3083–107.
34. Bliuc D, Tran T, van Geel T, et al. Mortality risk reduction differs according to bisphosphonate class: a 15-year observational study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2019;30(4):817–28.
35. Berger C, Langsetmo L, Joseph L, et al. Change in bone mineral density as a function of age in women and men and association with the use of antiresorptive agents. *CMAJ*. 2008;178(13):1660–8.
36. Gulson BL, Mahaffey KR, Jameson CW, et al. Mobilization of lead from the skeleton during the postnatal period is larger than during pregnancy. *J Lab Clin Med*. 1998;131(4):324–9.
37. Khalil N, Wilson JW, Talbott EO, et al. Association of blood lead concentrations with mortality in older women: a prospective cohort study. *Environ Health*. 2009;8:15.
38. Chen X, Mao G, Leng SX. Frailty syndrome: an overview. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2014;9:433–41.

39. Ensrud KE, Ewing SK, Taylor BC, et al. Frailty and risk of falls, fracture, and mortality in older women: the study of osteoporotic fractures. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2007;62(7):744–51.
40. Ensrud KE, Ewing SK, Cawthon PM, et al. A comparison of frailty indexes for the prediction of falls, disability, fractures, and mortality in older men. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2009;57(3):492–8.
41. Redlich K, Smolen JS. Inflammatory bone loss: pathogenesis and therapeutic intervention. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2012;11(3):234–50.
42. Corrado A, Santoro N, Cantatore FP. Extra-skeletal effects of bisphosphonates. *Joint Bone Spine*. 2007;74(1):32–8.
43. Talaat RM, Sidek A, Mosalem A, Kholief A. Effect of bisphosphonates treatment on cytokine imbalance between TH17 and Treg in osteoporosis. *Inflammopharmacology*. 2015;23(2–3):119–25.
44. Santini D, Martini F, Fratto ME, et al. In vivo effects of zoledronic acid on peripheral gammadelta T lymphocytes in early breast cancer patients. *Cancer Immunol Immunother*. 2009;58(1):31–8.
45. Farhat GN, Strotmeyer ES, Newman AB, et al. Volumetric and areal bone mineral density measures are associated with cardiovascular disease in older men and women: the health, aging, and body composition study. *Calcif Tissue Int*. 2006;79(2):102–11.
46. Steinbuch M, D'Agostino RB, Mandel JS, et al. Assessment of mortality in patients enrolled in a risedronate clinical trial program: a retrospective cohort study. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol*. 2002;35(3):320–6.
47. Kang JH, Keller JJ, Lin HC. Bisphosphonates reduced the risk of acute myocardial infarction: a 2-year follow-up study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2013;24(1):271–7.
48. Wolfe F, Bolster MB, O'Connor CM, Michaud K, Lyles KW, Colon-Emeric CS. Bisphosphonate use is associated with reduced risk of myocardial infarction in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2013;28(5):984–91.
49. Saag KG, Petersen J, Brandi ML, et al. Romosozumab or alendronate for fracture prevention in women with osteoporosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(15):1417–27.
50. Kim DH, Rogers JR, Fulchino LA, Kim CA, Solomon DH, Kim SC. Bisphosphonates and risk of cardiovascular events: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0122646.